

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,339	11/10/2003	Claude Bissonnette	36263	5167
116	7590 06/23/2005		EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			1742	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		₽.	رر					
		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)	(
Office Action Summary		10/70	5,339	BISSONNETTE, CLA	AUDE			
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
		Scott P	Kastler	1742				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu- or Reply	nication appears on	the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	∌SS			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come period for reply specified above is less than thirty (b) period for reply is specified above, the maximum sure to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In numunication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply are y will, by statute, cause the after the mailing date of thi	o event, however, may a s statutory minimum of thir and will expire SIX (6) MON application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	led on .						
<i>,</i> —	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	,—							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/s Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	are withdrawn from						
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on 10 November Applicant may not request that any objected the oath or declaration is objected to	er 2003 is/are: a) ection to the drawing of the correction is rec	s) be held in abeyar quired if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internations See the attached detailed Office actions	y documents have to y documents have to sof the priority docu onal Bureau (PCT I	peen received. peen received in A uments have been Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Sta	age			
Attachmen	t(s)							
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 of the Process of the PTO-1449 of the P		Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15 	52)			

Art Unit: 1742

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamashita. Yamashita teaches an apparatus for cutting comprising a cutting torch (1), means for moving the cutting torch in an arcuate path (10,11) which can be employed to direct the cutting torch continuously at a single point of a billet to be cut, where the means for moving the cutting torch includes an arcuate track (10), a frame (9) supporting the track, and means for moving the torch along the track at a constant rate which includes a linkage system (11) for converting rotational movement of a shaft to the movement of the cutting torch along the track, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims since the manner or method of use of the claimed apparatus (to cut a steel billet by aiming the cutting torch at a single point of the billet) cannot be relied upon to fairly further limit claims to the apparatus itself. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 and MPEP 2114.

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vainer et al. Vainer et al teaches an apparatus for cutting comprising a cutting torch (1), means for moving the cutting torch in an arcuate path (16, 24, 10, 11) which can be employed to direct the cutting torch continuously at a single point of a billet to be cut, where the means for moving the cutting torch includes an arcuate track (24), a frame (9) supporting the track, and means for moving the torch along the track at a constant rate which includes a linkage system (10,11) for converting

Art Unit: 1742

rotational movement of a shaft to the movement of the cutting torch along the track, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims since the manner or method of use of the claimed apparatus (to cut a steel billet by aiming the cutting torch at a single point of the billet) cannot be relied upon to fairly further limit claims to the apparatus itself. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 and MPEP 2114.

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roeder. Roeder teaches an apparatus for cutting comprising a cutting torch (52, 56 or 54), means for moving the cutting torch in an arcuate path (50) which can be employed to direct the cutting torch continuously at a single point of a billet to be cut, where the means for moving the cutting torch includes an arcuate track (82), and a frame (68) supporting the track, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims since the manner or method of use of the claimed apparatus (to cut a steel billet by aiming the cutting torch at a single point of the billet) cannot be relied upon to fairly further limit claims to the apparatus itself. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 and MPEP 2114.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1742

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,786,979 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims allow for the aiming of the cutting flame at a fixed point at the bottom of the strand or billet, as required by the claims of the '979 patent.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,824 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims allow for the aiming of the cutting flame at a fixed point at the bottom of the strand or billet, as required by the claims of the '824 patent'.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Kastler Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742 Page 5

sk